

(B) in the case of the total amount of fees, not be greater than the total amount appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for salaries and expenses directly attributable to registration of manufacturers and having products included in the information provided under section 1(a).

(3) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Fees collected for a fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be credited to the appropriation account for salaries and expenses of the Secretary of Commerce and shall be available in accordance with appropriation Acts until expended without fiscal year limitation.

(B) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—The fees imposed under paragraph (1) —

(i) shall be collected in each fiscal year in an amount equal to the amount specified in appropriation Acts for such fiscal year, and

(ii) shall only be collected and available for the costs described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 3. PENALTY.

Any manufacturer of a product who knowingly registers a product under section 2 which is not made in America or the equivalent thereof—

(1) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$7500 which the Secretary of Commerce may assess and collect, and

(2) shall not offer such product for purchase by the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "made in America or the equivalent thereof" means—

(A) an unmanufactured end product mined or produced in the United States; or

(B) an end product manufactured in the United States if the value of its components mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States equals 90 percent or more of the total value of all of its components.

(2) The term "product" means a product with a retail value of at least \$250.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or in any regulation promulgated under section 2 shall be construed to alter, amend, modify, or otherwise affect in any way, the Federal Trade Commission Act or the opinions, decisions, and rules of the Federal Trade Commission under such Act regarding the use of the term "made in America or the equivalent thereof" in labels on products introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce.

THE POSTAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1995

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1995

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Postal Privacy Act of 1995. This legislation is intended to protect the privacy of each U.S. resident who files a change of address notice with the U.S. Postal Service.

Few people are aware that when they change their address, the Postal Service makes the information public through a program called national change of address [NCOA]. NCOA has about 25 licenses—including many large direct mail companies—who receive all new addresses and sell address correction services to mailers. If you give your new address to the Postal Service, it can be distributed to thousands of mailers. When people ask "How did they get my new address?", the answer may be that it came from the Post-

al Service. People who want their mail forwarded—and who doesn't?—have no choice. File a change of address notice and your name and new address will be sold.

NCOA is a reasonable program because it saves the Postal Service and the mailing community money by making everyone more efficient. I support NCOA, but it needs one small change. People who file a change of address should be given a choice. They should have the option of having their mail forwarded without having their name and address sold to the world of direct mail advertisers. This is what the Postal Privacy Act of 1995 will do. It will give people a choice. It will not end the NCOA program.

Who might be concerned about keeping a new address private? Anyone who has fled an abusive spouse does not want the Postal Service giving out a new address. An individual who files a change of address notice on behalf of a deceased relative will not want the new address sold. Imagine sorting through the affairs of a deceased family member only to receive a mound of unwanted mail offering new products and services to that family member. Jurors in highly visible trials, public figures, and others may have a special need for privacy as might elderly people who may be more vulnerable to unwanted solicitations.

The bottom line is that everyone should have a choice about how his or her name and address is made available to others. You don't have to have a justification. It should be your decision. The Postal Service should not make this decision for you.

Recently, the Postal Service announced that it would provide some protection to individuals who have court orders protecting them against spousal abuse. This is a small step in the right direction, but it is not enough. It only protects those who have gone to the trouble and expense of obtaining a court order. Everyone should be entitled to the same option, but without the need for a court order. The Postal Service has demonstrated that it is possible to provide protection to people selectively. I want to extend the option to everyone.

There is nothing new about giving consumers a choice. The Direct Marketing Association has been a strong supporter of opt-out procedures which give individuals a choice about what type of mail they receive. The association supports its own a mail preference service that offers consumers an option. There is no reason why the Postal Service cannot do the same thing.

The Postal Privacy Act of 1995 is based on work done by the Government Operations Committee. Those who seek more information about NCOA should read "Give Consumers A Choice: Privacy Implications of U.S. Postal Service National Change of Address Program" (House Rept. 102-1067).

SALUTE TO FRANCIS SORRENTINO

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker I rise to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Francis "Frank" Sorrentino, who is retiring from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation [PennDot] after 34 years of distinguished and dedicated service.

Mr. Sorrentino, who received both his BSCE and MSCE from Drexel University in Philadelphia, has served for the past 5 years as the assistant district engineer for services in engineering district 6-0. The services unit has provided support activities for all of the PennDot design, construction, and maintenance activities in the district 6-0 jurisdiction of Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia Counties.

Mr. Sorrentino has led a staff of 95 engineering technical and clerical personnel responsible for the right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, geotechnical, survey, traffic, and municipal service functions of PennDot district 6-0.

Throughout his long career with PennDot, Mr. Sorrentino has shown leadership and dedication and a structural designer in the highway design unit, as chief project manager in the Philadelphia interstate office, as district soils engineer, and as administrator of the project management unit. He has also played a key role in the design, community coordination, and implementation of such major area highways as I-95, I-76 rehabilitation, I-476, and I-676.

Mr. Sorrentino will retire from service to PennDot on January 13 to enjoy more time with his wife Martha and three sons: Frank Jr., David, and Brian. I applaud and thank him for his commitment to Pennsylvania transportation system.

Further, I commend him for his ability, dedication, and pursuit of excellence in public service upon his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SUPERVISOR BRADY BEVIS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1995

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my district's most progressive elected officials, Marin County supervisor, Brady Bevis. Bevis was elected to represent the 5th Supervisorial District of Marin County in 1990. She has served the people of Novato and Marin County very well in this capacity for the past 4 years.

Brady is mother of five children and has been a resident of Marin for over 15 years.

As we celebrate Brady Bevis' years of service to this community, I wish to recognize Supervisor Bevis for her commitment to the people of Marin County, and to thank her for her long record of public service.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work closely with Supervisor Bevis over the last several years on important issues such as the conversion of Hamilton Field in Novato, bringing communications technology and training to the College of Marin with the Digital Village program at Indian Valley campus, fighting for Novato's cable concerns, and working to protect open space at Brookside Meadow. It has been a pleasure to work hand-in-hand with Brady. I continue to be impressed by her vision and sincere concern for others.

Brady Bevis has been a strong and vocal advocate for the city of Novato on the board of supervisors, and she has demonstrated